

STUDENT AND ANTI-WAR PERSPECTIVES

Amendment to the Band section on page 27
Submitted to Big Red Caucus by Joe Frantz and Dick Arneson

We come into this convention having witnessed the most massive explosion of the student movement in history. For the first time we have seen a movement of the overwhelming majority with entire new layers of students brought in and involved in it. Though the intensity and involvement (in terms of numbers) cannot continue, the effects of the strike will be long lasting. /Because of this, the possibility of a new student movement emerging exists.!

Due to the nature of the student movement, its tempo will remain uneven, in general being characterized by its explosive nature. The social framework within which students operate can in general be characterized by the declassé nature of students, their intellectual environment and ability to grasp and react to abstract and moral issues, and their relative freedom of movement and freedom from responsibility. However, the ignition for the explosions is most often (though not entirely) due to the fundamental contradiction of their situation: that is, the contradiction between the liberal ideology of the university and the actual role of the educational system in society and the repression necessary to maintain that role. (See "Education, Capitalism, and the Student Revolt.") The phenomenon of student rebelliousness reflects the changing social role of higher education in advanced capitalist society. Universities are no longer geared merely to preparing an elite stratum to run society. Today's hierarchically structured higher-education system, from junior colleges through the universities, trains skilled manual workers, white-collar workers and technicians, along with managerial and professional strata. Most of these students are being funneled through school into working-class jobs.

It is also this socio-economic position of students which places limits upon the student movement. Though capable of great shows of solidarity and determination, students alone lack the power in society necessary to force anything more than marginal concessions. We have continually stressed that students alone cannot force any significant changes, either in the universities themselves, or in society. However, we have never referred to this fact in such a way as to discourage students from embarking on struggle. The confrontation-oriented student struggles that have stirred the widest societal repercussions have posed broad social issues such as the war and racism which students as a social group are obviously incapable of resolving by themselves.

The 1960's have produced more young radicals than probably any other decade in American history. But this New Left has emerged at the tail end of a long period of American working class political quiescence. This unfortunate historical context has had a deforming effect on the student movement. Seeing their own long range powerlessness, and seeing no political motion by American workers, students have cast about for allies. This search began with a legitimate identification with black liberation struggles at home and Third World movements abroad. For many students this identification with third-world struggle has been

accompanied by cynicism about the revolutionary potential of the American working class. For a small but influential minority of the movement, this search for allies has ended in the adoption of authoritarian and explicitly stalinist ideologies. Another eddy stirring from the same source has been the increased popularity of terrorism as a political strategy. This drift of part of the movement toward elitist politics was accelerated by the demoralizing state of the movement itself during the period when the drift occurred: fall 1968-summer 1969. The elitist-radical wing of the movement forms a continuum with the mass of liberal students newly drawn into struggle in their common assumption that it is impossible to build a majoritarian movement challenging the institutions of American capitalism.

To all elitist tendencies within the student milieu, we counterpose the idea of a democratic movement expanding itself by making ties with other ongoing movements. At the time of FFP, we pushed an alliance with the left-wing of the black liberation movement and a long-range orientation toward American working people. Today, we are much more specific in emphasizing the need to link up with the working class. We attempt to broaden students' understanding that the growth of a political working class movement is necessary in order to realize the most significant goals of their own movement.

This character of student life precludes any transitional program for students in the sense of a system of demands that could impel students as a grouping toward the open struggle for socialism and the revolutionary seizure of state power. A Transitional Program, properly speaking, is a program for the working class. But, having said that, we recognize the need to relate to the student movement on the basis of what might be called transitional politics. These politics include programmatic alternatives that can suggest the next step forward in concrete struggle and point to a general political direction for the movement as a whole. An I.S. program for the student movement must include the following elements:

**IMMEDIATE WITHDRAWAL FROM SOUTHEAST ASIA AND ALL FOREIGN COUNTRIES,
END IMPERIALISM**

End the draft

Abolish the standing army

- Disband the National Guard

No foreign aid to reactionary puppet regimes, For a democratic foreign policy.

End military spending. Use our resources to produce more and better housing, mass transit, medical care, education, day care centers, etc.

SUPPORT TO STRUGGLES OF OPPRESSED GROUPS. END RACISM AND SEXISM.

Equal pay for equal work. Preferential hiring where oppressed groups have been discriminated against.

Free abortion and free birth control.

24 hour free, client-staff controlled child-care centers.

Third World and Women's Liberation Colleges.

3. TO THE WORKING CLASS

Price controls, not wage controls.
Jobs for all. 30 for 40.
No taxes on working people. Tax the corporations.
Workers control of industry. Humanize working conditions.
Support the national strike wave.
For a living wage and decent working conditions for campus workers.
For anti-war work stoppages.

4. NO SUPPORT TO THE DEMOCRATIC OR REPUBLICAN WAR PARTIES

Independent political action by the radical movement.
For a Workers' Party.

5. STUDENT-FACULTY-STAFF CONTROL OF COLLEGES.

Break corporate control of education. Kick out the Regents.
End campus complicity
- End ROTC
- Cancel defense contracts. No war research.
Turn the University into an Organizing Center against the war.
- Full use of campus facilities:
- No business as usual; no regularly scheduled classes held; liberation classes as adjunct to anti-war work.
- Full participation by campus employees.
Open admissions paid for by taxing corporations.
--No tuition
- End tracking
- Subsidies to children of oppressed minorities and working people.
No more classroom authoritarianism

6. AGAINST REPRESSION. FREE ALL POLITICAL PRISONERS

End harassment of Panthers; Free Bobby, Huey and Ericka, Amnesty for Cleaver.
Free the Conspiracy 7, stop the Seattle conspiracy trial.
Rescind the Conspiracy Law and the Rap Brown Act.
Defend the civil liberties of the movement. For the right to organize on campus.
- Cops off campus
- No political firings or suspensions.

This program combines demands that flow from students' needs to challenge the worst aspects of society and the university and also to refashion the university as a tool for reshaping society. In a consistent radical way, this program poses the broad social issues that students should fight on and a strategy for strengthening their struggles.

We do not counterpose our full program to existing student struggles or, for that matter, to any other existing struggles. Nor do we pose a pro-working class orientation for the movement as an alternative to combative, militant struggle today. We point out that confrontation with the state will be politically fruitless unless combined with a strategy of reaching out to working people and articulating student struggles in such a way as to divide the community response along class lines. A pro-working class orientation only makes sense for a fighting movement that carries on

f -
its own independent struggles: if students were to limit their political activity to pressurizing workers, they would have nothing to say to these workers. Indeed, it is just at those times when the student movement is in upsurge, as in the case of Cambodia, that a strategy of linking up with workers appears most reasonable and realistic. It follows that part of our working-class orientation for the student movement includes encouraging the independent struggle of students, working in them wherever they break out, initiating and leading them where politically feasible.

The cutting edge of our intervention in the student movement is the slogan - turn to the working class. The recent pickup in the tempo of working class economic struggle points to the possibility of a pro-working class student movement. The polarized consciousness evidenced in the pro-war demonstration of 150,000 NYC construction workers points to its urgency.

When workers are on strike they will be more receptive to anti-war and other radical ideas than when they are subject to the job routine. During strikes, especially tough strikes, workers naturally are looking for community support, and they often begin to feel more open toward the student movement. We have stressed the need for strike support and strike-related activities. We will continue to stress this kind of activity, seizing whatever opportunities exist in the coming period.

In addition, during campus uprisings, we urge the movement to append to its own demands pro-working class slogans and demands like the following: JOBS FOR ALL, NO WAR TAXES ON WORKING PEOPLE - TAX THE CORPORATIONS, OPEN ADMISSIONS TO THE UNIVERSITY FOR ALL;; END MILITARY SPENDING - USE OUR RESOURCES TO PROVIDE MORE AND BETTER EDUCATION, MEDICAL CARE, MASS TRANSIT, PRICE CONTROL, NOT WAGE CONTROL. In arguing for the inclusion of demands of this sort, we specifically address ourselves to the problem of the conservative political ideas that presently dominate the consciousness of workers. For all the reasons that Marxists have always called attention to, the basic social position of workers does not impel them toward reactionary politics; quite the reverse. But economic and social events do not mechanically turn workers in a direction of left-wing militancy. These events are filtered through workers' present low level of understanding, itself a legacy of the attacks on the workers' movement during and shortly after World War II, the Cold War Stalinophobia of the 1950's, and generally to relative quiescence of the postwar decades. This problem of lagging consciousness suggests the need for radical students to intervene. Workers feel the double crunch of taxation and inflation, and increasingly they face the spectre of rising unemployment, as the cycle shifts towards recession. It is important for the student movement to address itself programmatically and agitationaly to these economic issues in a radical way. Equally important is the need for the movement educationally to challenge workers' attitudes about racism, imperialism, patriotism and sexual chauvinism. Workers' reactionary views on these subjects retard their own class struggles and are not in their interest in the deepest sense.

Whenever possible, we should give organizational form to our strategy for the movement - as we did at several campuses during

the Cambodian crisis, by organizing labor and work-stoppage committees.

The student movement huddles around its own organizational history, seemingly unable to re-form itself after the collapse of SDS. This lack of organization aggravates what would be a serious problem anyway, viz. the uneven, up-and-down character of student struggles. Organizing the student movement is a bit like trying to build a fire using only paper as fuel. However, while recognizing the historical reasons for the disorganization of the movement, we do not fatalistically accept the present state of affairs as inevitable. The vacuum of stable organization is an obstacle to sustained student struggle and a barrier to student radicalization. We point out to the movement the need for democratically controlled rank-and-file organization. The liberal wing of the movement has its organizational vehicles - the Movement for a New Congress and the campaign committees of the Congressional doves. If it is to present itself as a serious counter-leadership, the left wing of the movement must grow up organizational forms. Agitationally, we call for the formation of broad radical student organization around programs of action - people can unite in struggle, not on the basis of pre-formed ideology. When ad-hoc groupings arise during campus crises we push for these groupings to shape themselves as ongoing organizations that can agitate, educate and initiate action during the lulls between storms.

On highly politicized campuses, no single sect is capable of uniting the movement into an umbrella radical organization. In fact, the opposite process tends to occur: what begin as umbrella organizations end up as embryonic socialist sects. On such campuses, we do not seek to hold together over the long run broad organizations that would collapse were it not for our leadership, although, where possible, we attempt to unite with other groups and individuals to spur such organization into existence.

On campuses which are "younger" in terms of the history of their movement, a different situation often prevails. When the campus either belatedly explodes or moves more slowly into political action, it is possible for a political group to coalesce a broad movement organization. On some campuses, the YSA has succeeded in making SMC the organization of the movement, on a few campuses PL has done the same with SDS. I.S. chapters are concentrated at highly political campuses, although we could play a much larger role at campuses that are just being drawn into the fray. We must realize that as the student movement spreads to new campuses, the leadership role and strategic importance of traditional radical centers like Berkeley or Columbia will diminish. Also, the working class upsurge will thrust into prominence campuses in industrial cities, where a pro-working class orientation is more actionable. For both these reasons, we put high priority on taking I.S. cadres from developed campuses and sending them out as organizers into new campuses to form new I.S. chapters and to play a role in the student movement there.

5 - Another area requiring greater emphasis is work in predominantly working class schools, schools such as city and state universities, community colleges, post-high school technical and vocational schools and high schools. The Kent State - Cambodia crisis provoked more dramatic movement here than earlier crises, and broadened the possibility of involving these new layers in working class oriented movements.

(In particular, we feel this document requires an analysis of the high school movement, and our possible role in it. But we feel ourselves incapable of writing such analysis. - Joe & Dick)

Anti-war Perspectives

The anti-war issue, both because of its importance to the student movement and to society as a whole, will continue to be the central issue around which activities will revolve.

We reject the economic deterministic arguments of most of the movement that the capitalist class cannot withdraw from Southeast Asia because of the economic imperialistic interests it has there. Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam taken in themselves have neither the economic assets (such as raw materials) nor the military strategic importance that would necessitate continued U.S. involvement.

The main reasons that the U.S. became militarily involved in Vietnam and is unwilling to extricate itself relate to America's role as the leading capitalist power and the defender of capitalism as a world system against Stalinism, to American determination to prevent the boost to national liberation struggles throughout the world that would be the result of a defeat in Indochina, and to American resolve to maintain "free world" hegemony by containing China.

A split has developed within the American capitalist class during the course of the war. This split arose as a result of the fear of the dislocations at home, both social and economic, and the hopeless military situation of the war.

We anticipate that the eventual outcome of the war will be the inauguration of a shaky coalition government, followed by an NLF takeover. While we support the victory of the NLF on the basis of the right of nations to self-determination, we realize that NLF victory will mean the consolidation of a bureaucratic collectivist regime in South Vietnam and we carry on educational work inside the American anti-war movement about the political implications of this outcome.

Nixon's strategy (as much as he has one) seems to be to de-escalate the American side of the war by withdrawing ground combat

7- troops, while maintaining military bases in South Vietnam, and continuing to provide air support for the Vietnamese. Nixon will not just withdraw all troops, being much more impressed with the arguments about the disastrous political effects of such a move. However, the recent invasion and related events in Cambodia, taken in order to prevent a communist or communist supported Sihanouk takeover, threatens even Nixon's limited objectives. The spreading of the war throughout Indochina makes further de-escalation more difficult and has led to a very unstable and explosive situation, where it is not even impossible to see in the future the Cambodians fighting the South Vietnamese.

With the war foundering on, and with future political problems with our "allies" a real possibility, we can expect a further intensification of the anti-war movement.

The split in the capitalist class over the war issue has occasioned two contending strategies in the anti-war movement, and the differences between these strategies as well as the relative strength of their adherents were sharply focussed in the recent Cambodian upsurge.

The strategy of the liberal wing of the anti-war movement is to build support for the dove wing of the capitalist class and the liberal politicians who represent them. The liberals conceive of the movement as a pressure group whose role is to influence the rulers of this country. They do not see clearly the relationships between the war and the social crisis here in America, and so they have no strategy for linking up the various protest movements born in this crisis. Nor do they see the anti-war movement as potentially challenging the American social order. The vast majority of the students who participated in the nationwide strike must be distinguished from the liberal wing of the movement properly speaking. The liberals -- the Sam Brown types, the leaders of the old Mobilization Committee and the Movement for a New Congress, et al -- are clear in their basic commitment to the American capitalist status quo. They are willing to float on top of the peace movement as its moderate leadership, and to take leadership of dissent that does not challenge established institutions, but their loyalty is to the system, not to changing the system. The students and parts of the middle-income strata who form the mass of the anti-war movement are largely politically amorphous and unformed. They presently follow the lead of the liberal leadership, but unlike that leadership their commitment is to ending the war and to changing American society for the better. Whether these goals can be reached within the framework of established institutions is a question about which most anti-war students are confused or uncertain. Obviously our political orientation within the movement is geared toward winning over the politically diffuse and volatile student masses not to influencing the ideologically crystallized liberals described above.

Roughly conterposed to the liberal wing of the movement is its radical sector. Itself divided and subdivided by political differences, this section of the anti-war movement is composed of those who in some way view themselves as in opposition to the social system that produced the Vietnam War. The radicals are

-8- hostile to the bi-partisan foreign policy that has set the tone of American world hegemony since World War II and of which the Vietnam War is just one manifestation. They see the anti-war movement as an independent political force that fights to win concessions from the ruling class, and which at least ideologically poses a challenge to the entire capitalist order.

Simultaneously opportunist, pragmatic, and thoroughly confused, the radicals have erred most disastrously in their generally sectarian response to the rest of the movement. Yet we consider ourselves part of this radical wing of the movement, and we work to cohere a grouping that can win over the rest of the movement to a pro-working class, multi-issue approach. In short, we tell the radicals to be transitional toward the mass of non-radicals. It goes without saying that when radicals refuse to take our transitional approach we are willing to pose ourselves as the radical leadership of the movement.

It is worth noting that even from the point-of-view of the liberal wing of the movement, the radicals have the outline of a better strategy for attaining the movement's common goals. The liberal method is to accommodate to the political center and nestle up to the political mainstream. But in fact, to the extent that the anti-war movement threatens the social power of the capitalist class, to that extent can it be successful in winning whatever reformed capitalism is capable of granting in this period. Our goals -- pushing the movement in an anti-capitalist and pro-working class direction -- are compatible with the movement's goal of ending the war. Our program, the most consistent radical alternative, answers to the needs of the entire movement and not merely of the socialists within it.

Our strategy for the movement is to stiffen its oppositional character. Thus we raise the interlocked issues of imperialism and the permanent arms economy. We urge that the anti-war movement ally itself with the ongoing struggle movements -- the black and native American and Spanish-speaking liberation movements, the radical women's movement. We call on the anti-war movement to support workers' struggles and take up pro-working class demands. This turn to the working class is especially critical because in a long-range sense it opens the prospect of galvanizing into being a movement that can contest for social power. And part of this radical strategy for building the movement is the strategy of Independent Political Action. Short of taking IPA, a protest movement cannot present itself as other than a pressure group hoping to gain the attention or sympathy of the country's rulers. Only in the electoral arena can a movement appear to the American public as an alternative political leadership vying to displace the present rulers.

The failure of any section of the movement to initiate an electoral challenge to the capitalist parties was one key factor in the ease with which the tide of spring anti-war sentiment flowed smoothly into the primary campaigns of "peace" Democrats. By now the opportunity for actionable Independent Political Action in the fall 1970 electoral arena (except for possible isolated cases) has already been missed. The stated intention of university

administrations at Princeton and elsewhere to close down schools for a few days prior to the election in order to give students full time for anti-war electioneering gives us a hint of what to expect. No challenge to this capitalist electoralism will emanate from the established Left. The line of the CP this fall will coincide with the liberal strategy -- to build support for the "progressive" capitalist politicians. The mass marches -- political abstentionist approach of the YSA-SWP will objectively serve the same purpose.

Beginning in the summer of 1971 popular attention will rivet on the 1972 Presidential race. Assuming that the war will still be going on, as appears certain, the Democratic Party will be the repository of hopes for an anti-war candidate and the selection of a dove as the DP Presidential candidate will probably be the upshot of these hopes. The fact that the Democratic Party is out of power enhances its co-optive appeal and its ability to masquerade as the legitimate champion of anti-war sentiment. For these reasons we did not anticipate that IPA will become actionable for the anti-war movement in the near future.

In our fall 1970 agitation around the issue of IPA we stress the necessity of political action by the existing anti-war movement. We thus counterpose ourselves agitationaly to the electoral sectarianism of the YSA SWP ("Against the war? Vote Socialist"). We couple our call for IPA with our general pro-working class strategy for the anti-war movement and in particular with our slogan "For a Workers' Party."

We must exploit the possibilities offered by the entry of a section of the labor bureaucrats into the anti-war movement for developing the pro-working class elements in the movements. At the same time, we must attack the bureaucrats for their role in conservatizing the working class and for their failure to mobilize the ranks of the unions against the war.

We do not put forward our pro-working class orientation as though it offered a panacea for the movement's myriad problems. Rather, our program points a political direction and is the only way that the movement can capitalize on the new opportunities for politically intervening in the working class.

This fall students returning to the campus will be confronted with the question, whether to attempt to reconstitute the nationwide strike that was left dangling last spring. The possibility of re-kindling this strike hinges on political developments this fall. The focus of the November Congressional elections will be one factor mitigating against student militancy, since liberal students will not want to jeopardize the prospects of electing "peace" Democrats by triggering campus upheaval. There may even be an attempt by the Movement for a New Congress or another grouping of that ilk to isolate radicals from liberals by enforcing a moratorium on political demonstrations along the lines of the cooling of civil rights struggle to help elect LBJ that occurred in 1964. Any such attempt to advise the movement to cool it this fall must be combated head-on. We do not expect that a nationwide student strike will be possible unless an escalation of the war or some equivalent atrocity takes place. But if the political atmosphere is explosive,

we will take the lead in calling for shutting down universities across the country and using the universities as organizing centers for anti-war work. Short of a nationwide strike, we push the movement to use whatever university facilities it can control for anti-war work. Also we call for campaigns against university involvement in the war: ROTC and war-related research. Finally, we call for a fall labor student offensive against the war and against the repression of the student, working class, and black movements. We should push for the type of demonstration like the one in New York, or ones called by workers themselves. Furthermore, we should point to the upcoming auto strike as an important opportunity to show its solidarity on a massive scale with workers' resistance to the economic effects of the war. Where possible we establish labor committees like the ones that grew out of the Kent State - Cambodia crisis, in order to relate to this strike and to carry on educational work about workers on the campus, and to do whatever else is possible to establish links between workers and students.

With regard to the DP peace candidate movement, we aim where possible to expose the anti-labor views of these candidates, and stress that we cannot trade peace abroad for repression at home. We must also stress the imperialist nature of the war and other military efforts of the U.S. While many DPers do oppose this losing war, virtually none will oppose the overall imperialist nature of our foreign policy. Our central theme is that these politicians do not represent the anti-war movement and they are not responsible to it once in office; they are candidates of the Party most responsible for the war. Rather than feed movements into the death trap of the capitalist parties we call for political action independent of the DP and point toward the ultimate need for a workers' party. '

One key role a program for the anti-war movement must play is to expand popular understanding of the links between the war, the permanent arms economy and the economic squeeze on workers that has accompanied the war. The permanent arms economy, backbone of U.S. imperialism, itself causes an inflationary tendency in the economy and a resultant lower standard of living for workers. This expresses itself today in the squeeze in workers' real wages and the visible decline in social services -- health, education, mass transit, child-care centers, housing, etc. We counter workers' fears that their jobs and livelihood are dependent on defense contracts and the permanent arms economy by raising programmatically the idea that the military budget be used to produce for human needs, not waste and profit. This kind of demand shows how an immediate end to the war could be part of a just solution to the social crisis spawned by the war. We therefore propose the following slogans: U.S. OUT OF SOUTHEAST ASIA AND ALL FOREIGN COUNTRIES -- END IMPERIALISM; PRICE CONTROLS NOT WAGE CONTROLS -- SUPPORT THE LABOR STRIKE WAVE: END ALL MILITARY SPENDING -- USE OUR RESOURCES TO PRODUCE FOR HUMAN NEEDS; FREE ALL POLITICAL PRISONERS; SUPPORT BLACK & THIRD WORLD LIBERATION MOVEMENTS AND WOMENS LIBERATION; NO SUPPORT TO THE DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN WAR PARTIES.

Finally, in those shops where we have members, or where there are caucuses, we push for the caucus as a group to participate in the anti-war activities, to get speakers if possible, and to attempt to get workers in the shop to attend. We also make demands upon the bureaucrats to mobilize support among other workers for the anti-war movement, and to call work-stoppages and other activities against the war. However we do not hesitate to urge rank-and-file workers to build work stoppages when the bureaucrats do nothing.

An important part of our orientation to the campus is the inclusion of campus workers in our anti-war work. In the recent past and specifically over the Cambodia events many workers for the first time have felt some solidarity with a previously all student movement. Particularly workers in many campuses have begun organizing trade unions out of this anti-war impulse as well as traditional trade union demands. For us this is a significant development because of the role which these organizing groups and nascent locals can play as focal points for workingclass anti-war groupings and for their effect on the student movement itself in forging a real alliance ~~xxx~~ of workers and students.

To build a national organization, the IS must intervene on a national scale in national movements. Lacking for now the organizational resources of PL or YSA, in order to publicly and effectively put forward a national strategy we must depend largely on existing organizations of the anti-war movement. The SMC is the only national organization of anti-war sentiment which can in any sense claim a rank and file following. Organized by the YSA and based on the single-issue "Bring Our Boys Home Now" slogan, the SMC claims chapters of at least five people on 155 campuses throughout the country. It is the dominant political force on some campuses, especially campuses which are politically unformed and whose enrollment is neither elite-university nor working class-junior college but rather lies in between (state colleges). Because it is the only national organization and voice of anti-war activists its national conventions have been among the most important forums for debate about the political direction of the anti-war movement. At the SMC national conference in February of this year about 4000 people attended, including 1500 who voted against YSA's single-issue strategy. Thus participating in national and regional conferences to draw attention to our program is a high priority, although we do not view SMC as a major arena. Where the SMC has a rank and file we should try to cohere a left wing around the central points of our program. On campuses with a history of political struggle the SMC tends to attract the most conservative elements of the anti-war movement and it may well be impossible in such places to operate fruitfully inside the SMC.

In such places and where no SMC exists we should when possible organize anti-war groups with our perspective. These organizations would, as part of their role, intervene in national and regional SMC's. Our comrades in SMC should write for the Mobilizer, provide our own leaflets for building the demonstrations, fight for them to be adopted by the SMC and if this doesn't happen, attempt to enlist support of other people in helping us to hand them out, and

finally where possible we organize contingents of people for demonstrations marching under banners with political slogans incorporating our politics. In all work inside the SMC we do not function simply as a loyal opposition, we organize activity around our political line. If we do our work well we can expose to a large section of the SMC the bureaucratic machinations of the YSA and win them over to multi-issue pro-workingclass politics.